

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

The Applicant thanks the Office for the careful consideration given to his application in the communication mailed 12/13/2006. In that communication, the Office objected to the Oath or Declaration because it did not have the Applicant's address, objected to the drawings due to reference numbers, and objected to the Abstract.

Claims 1 – 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 1 – 33 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bates (5,769,281).

Regarding the Applicant's address in the Declaration, the Applicant respectfully points out that an Application Data Sheet that has the Applicant's full address was filed with the application. The ADS is present in the Image File Wrapper. The Applicant believes this fulfills the Office's requirement.

Regarding the drawings, the Applicant hereby submits replacement drawing sheets to replace the drawings on file.

Regarding the Specification, the Applicant herewith submits a substitute specification under 37 C.F.R. 1.125, MPEP 608.01(q). The Applicant has made the corrections pointed out by the Office in the substitute specification. References numbers in the specification have been corrected or deleted, as appropriate. No new matter has added in the substitute specification. Both a clean copy and marked up copy are attached to this Amendment.

Regarding the Abstract, the Applicant has amended the Abstract to comply with the applicable requirements. The amended Abstract appears as the last page of the substitute specification.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, Applicant points out that the claims elements for the process and apparatus claims are amply supported in the specification, as is most easily seen in the

drawings. Claims 3 – 6 are canceled. However, Applicant disagrees with the Office's rejection of claim 7, and asserts that the time a step takes (e.g. six seconds, as here) is a proper dependent claim for process claim subject matter, and therefore should be allowable.

Regarding the rejection for anticipation, the Applicant points out that independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to require the pie-shaped zones to be positioned edge to edge to each other. In the Bates reference, the shapes are inserts that are spaced apart. Therefore, the Applicant believes that the claims are no longer anticipated by Bates.

Respectfully submitted,

/Phillip E. Decker/

Date: June 13, 2007
Tel. No. 603-766-1910
Fax No. 603-766-1901

Phillip E. Decker, Reg. No. 39,163
Attorney for Applicant
1 New Hampshire Ave., Suite 125
Portsmouth, NH 03801